

For observations, about fossil
specimens are curious but fossil
are the most doubtful subject
for specific distinction. modern
researches have shown that recent
shells which greatly resemble each
other may have very different animal
ended animals showing they
may belong not only to different
species but different genera & families
now our knowledge of the fossil
species must always be so
imperfect that the identity of
fossil & recent species must
always remain doubtful.

I believe that species of parts
of animals where there history

British Museum
12 April 1860

My dear Mr

I have ^{read} with great interest
your review of Darwin's
Book, and you should have
a ^{separate} copy of it to spare I should
be much obliged to you
for it.

I am pleased with many
points in it but I must
own that I am far from
sorry with you on the subject

and think I far too favourable
on the work which unleaves
to many fallacious reasoning
I should be very glad to believe
there was some truth in the
Hypothesis but the more
I examine the subject the
less I believe of truth there is to
be found in it. and I think
that Dr Hooker must have
felt this or he would not
have prevented the publication
of Dr Harvey, very interesting

and convincing. Ten I suspect
It is a pity that Darwin should
make such assertions & that
they should be copied without
comment that any one might
be made to believe should ever
have made the discovery of
Regions. Genera or Species
though they may have characters
that might look well on paper
Every child at once sees they
are Regions. and there is the
same ^{kind} of assertion on various
heads of the Works

how one ~~specimen~~ species
changes into another - yet I
know in some instances the
last named species which may
be observed growing side by
side under the exact same
circumstances - in such as
cases I am inclined to regard
them as distinct.

Mr. Waterhouse says in family
Hyacinthaceae believe me
you very much
John Edm. Gray

is pretty well known. and firmly
established and subject of doubt
to any competent judges. our
doubt chiefly arose from the
imperfection of material and
from observations.

We must recollect that a large
number of very large populations
of species are described from
a single part (as a shell for Mollusc
or from a single state of an
animal as a skull the generality
of insect - then again there
are such premiums for the
"manufacture" of species. and
we have abundance of "dealers
species" because presumed
new species sell better than

old well known ones so
many old ones are sold under
new names this is especially
the case with shells. There
there are ichthyographers species
men publishing illustrated
monographs who pride them-
selves on figures so many
new species. as those that
we may add species
described by incompetent
heron who delight to see
their name quoted.

And the search, fair way under

such circumstances that
naturalists differ widely in
regard to the number of species
in existence -

Should have been much more
satisfied with the Bentham
work if he had given us the
reason why he reduced
many of Anthony's species
especially as I think I
have heard Mr Bentham say
that he chiefly describes
for specimens in an Herbarium
Lindleyan consult. even a Botanic
Garden - and ^{he} had shown